

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claims 1-17 are rejected.

Priority Documents

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for confirming receipt of the priority documents.

35 USC 102 (b)

Claims 1-10 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Langley et al, US 4753710 or Langley US 4913775.

Both Langley's discuss recycled paper or deinked waste paper. US '710 in col. 8, lines 8-14 and in US '775 in col. 8, lines 14-19. Neither reference mentions cellulosic suspension with **white pitch**. White pitch is clearly defined in the present application on page 2, paragraph 3.

White pitch is sticky, light gray substance which is found as a deposit on metal surfaces in the wet-end, forming press, or dryer sections of the paper machine. It is termed "white" to distinguish it from the brown or black pitch, which results from materials contained in the wood.

The white pitch problem has been shown to be caused by the relatively high use of coated paper in the furnish of mills experiencing the problem.

Both references exemplify various pulp systems, some of which contain recycled white water, broke (not coated broke), and sizing such as ketene dimer. There are examples of recycled paper or broke. See examples 4, 15, 20 of US '775.

However, there is no actual disclosure in either reference which would make the process of reducing the deposition of white pitch inherent as neither reference discloses a pulp containing white pitch (coated recycled paper or coated broke).

The Applicant's disclosure reads on page on page 8, second paragraph **"waste paper includes coated waste, which owing to the content of binders for coatings and printing inks, gives rise to white pitch."**

The Langley references to deinked waste paper is not an adequate disclosure to cause anticipation, because there is no mention or suggestion in either Langley that the paper stock contains pulp which contains white pitch (or recycle furnish derived from coated broke or coated paper).

Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Humphreys et al US 6,103,065.

Humphrey's makes reference to waste paper contaminants (col. 6, lines 60-65). But makes no reference to white pitch, coated broke or coated recycled pulp.

The present method claims a process for making paper comprising addition to a paper stock an effective amount for reducing the deposition of **white pitch** of at least one cationic coagulant polymer or an inorganic coagulant and followed by the addition of a microparticle material, wherein the paper stock contains pulp derived at least in part from recycled paper product.

Humphrey makes no mention of white pitch, coated recycled paper product or coated broke. Thus there is no disclosure to reduce deposition of white pitch. Anticipation requires that all the elements of the present claims be present or inherently present. This is not the case. Thus Humphrey's does not anticipate and the 102(b) rejection is overcome.

35 USC 103(a)

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langley US '710 or Langley US '775.

Examiner states that both Langley references do not disclose paper made by their process. However, example 20 of US '775 appears to make newprint.

Only Langley US '775 makes several references to pitch. See column 12, lines 40-41 and example 19, Table 20 and lines 36-37. However, these references to pitch are references to natural pitch as there is no mention in Langley of coated broke or coated recycled paper which gives rise to white pitch.

As Langley neither disclosures nor suggests white pitch or stickies, the process of removing them cannot be obvious. Because there is no suggestion within either of these references the Applicants aver the rejection is improper and requests reconsideration.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Langleys in view of Shimasaki.

Shimasaki is primarily concerned with the formation of polyalkylene polyamines. Shimaskaki makes no mention of white pitch thus the reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Langleys.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 is respectfully solicited in light of the remarks *supra*.

Since there are no other grounds of objection or rejection, passage of this application to issue with claims 1-17 is earnestly solicited.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. In the event that minor amendments will further prosecution, Applicants request that the examiner contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



for

Shiela A. Loggins
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 56,221

TYLER STEVENSON
Reg No 46388

Ciba Specialty Chemicals Corporation
540 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, New York 10591
(914) 785-2768
SAL\22330.doc